

Attorney Docket No. 5405-225

PATENT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 09 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Boustany
Serial No.: 09/830,045
Filed: January 23, 2002
For: METHODS OF SCREENING FOR RISK OF PROLIFERATIVE DISEASE AND
METHODS FOR THE TREATMENT OF PROLIFERATIVE DISEASE

Group Art Unit: 1634
Examiner: J. Goldberg
Confirmation No.: 9439

August 8, 2006

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Attn: Office of Patent Publication/Publishing Division

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF DRAWING INCONSISTENCY WITH SPECIFICATION

Sir:

This is responsive to the "Notice of Drawing Inconsistency with Specification" (Form PTO-1631) mailed July 26, 2006 regarding the above-referenced patent application, in which it is stated that Figures 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 are listed in the Brief Description of Drawings in the specification, but not contained in the Drawings.

Applicants wish to point out that each of the following references, to Figure 1 on page 3, line 21, to Figure 2 on page 4, line 21, to Figure 3 on page 4, line 33, to Figure 5 on page 6, line 3 and to Figure 8 on page 7, lines 16-17, as recited in the specification are not describing specific figures identified only as 1, 2, 3, 5 or 8, but rather are providing an introduction to the description of the figures recited immediately below these references in the specification. Thus, there is no specific Figure 1, because the corresponding figures are described in the specification and drawings as Figure 1A, Figure 1B, Figure 1C and Figure 1D. Similarly, there is no specific Figure 2, because the corresponding figures are described in the specification and drawings as Figure 2A and Figure 2B. Also, there is no specific Figure 3, because the corresponding figures are described in the specification and drawings as Figure 3A, Figure 3B and Figure 3C. There is no specific Figure 5, because the corresponding figures are described in the specification and drawings as Figure 5A, Figure 5B, Figure 5C and Figure 5D. Finally, there is no specific Figure

Attorney Docket No. 5405-225
Applicant Serial No: 09/830,045
Filing Date: January 23, 2002
Page 2 of 2

8, because the corresponding figures are described in the specification and drawings as Figure 8A and Figure 8B.

Applicants believe that this explanation is adequate in demonstrating that there is no inconsistency between the drawings and specification and that this response adequately addresses all issues raised in the Notice of Drawing Inconsistency with Specification.

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiency associated with this filing, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0220.

Respectfully submitted,



Mary L. Miller
Registration No. 39,303

Customer Number 20792
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P.O. Box 37428, Raleigh, NC 27627
919-854-1400
919-854-1401 (Fax)

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE
TRANSMISSION
UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office via the central facsimile number 571-273-8300 on August 9, 2006 and is addressed to Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Tracy Wallace